

- REMARKS -

REPLACEMENT DRAWINGS: New drawing sheet 3/5 "Figure 3A" for the above application is enclosed, corrected as necessary. Please substitute this for the corresponding sheets on file.

Applicant submits the above Amendment in response to the objections identified in the first Office Action (OA) in the prosecution of this application.

Under item 3 in the OA, an objection was made to the drawings for not including the limitation of the ability to bend the frame or the mounting point between the reflector assembly and the frame for the purposes of adjusting the lenses. In response to this, the detailed description of the drawings was amended to describe the applicant's idea regarding the adjustment of the lenses. The drawings show the mounting point being described and with the amendment, the description of the drawing adequately describes the limitation.

In response to item 4 of the OA, drawing 3A was amended to correct the duplicate of reference character "9." Likewise, corrections were made to the detailed description of the drawings in accordance with item 5 of the OA.

The detailed description of the drawings was amended to address the objections of item 7 in the OA. Additionally, drawing 3A was modified to call out the leading edge of Claim 7.

Claim 1 was amended to address the objection of OA item 9 under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Primeau (3,058,392). The natural limitation that the invention reflects incident light to the periphery of the eye was added to the claim. This addresses the objection to Claim 2 as well due to the fact that Claim 2 is a dependent claim. The purpose of the applicant's invention is to aid macular degeneration patients by reflecting incident light to the periphery of the eye. All of the patents identified by the examiner are for purposes other than that of this invention and therefore do not reflect light to the periphery of the eye, but to the normally responsive macula. This modification adds an additional limitation to the claims that is not found in the other patents. A similar modification to Claim 4 addresses item 10 in the OA.

Modifications to detailed description of the drawings in response to item 12 of the OA explain the unobvious solution to the problem encountered when attaching two aligned reflector assemblies to a headpiece. The disclosed patents depict a device with reflectors mounted to the front of the frame. This would be the easiest and most obvious way to attach the reflectors, but this configuration causes the large overall depth to the entire assembly. The lenses protrude

much further from the patient's face than an ordinary pair of eyeglasses. Moving the mounting points to the sides of the reflector assemblies so that reflector assemblies may be moved closer to the patient's face is a novel way to make the invention more comfortable and visually appealing.

In light to the Examiner's findings and discussion of item 13 of the OA, Applicant has elected to withdraw Claim 5.

Applicant has amended the specification and claims and presented the aforementioned clarifications in response to each objection in the OA. If, for any reason, this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicants respectfully request the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to MPEP §§ 2173.02 and 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible without the need for further proceedings.


Sincerely,



W. Michael Cooper, Esq.
Registration No. 55929
Attorney of Record for:
Thir, Peter

Certificate of Mailing: I certify that on the date below I mailed this correspondence, with any attachments, as Express Mail with the United States Postal Service, to Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1540, Alexandria, VA 22313.

April 15, 2005


W. Michael Cooper, Esq.